

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

LAMONE T. BLUE,)	CASE NO. C05-0315-TSZ-JPD
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER (SECOND) RE:
)	MISCELLANEOUS FILINGS AND
DAVIS, et al.,)	DEFENDANT'S RESPONSES
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action. This matter comes before the court upon plaintiff's submission of a document on August 29, 2005, in which plaintiff appears to express concern that the following individuals have not been served: correctional officer Williams, school teacher Liz, Beecroft, Pat Glebe, and Ralph Best. Dkt. No. 36. Plaintiff's document is extremely difficult for the Court to decipher. Dkt. No. 36. Plaintiff is again reminded that all submissions must be legible and conform with the Court's filing requirements. Submissions must contain a caption with the case name and file number. They should clearly state at the outset what plaintiff requests and then why. PLAINTIFF IS SPECIFICALLY WARNED THAT FAILURE TO COMPLY MAY RESULT IN REJECTION, BY THE CLERK'S OFFICE, OF PAPERS SUBMITTED.

01 The Court notes that plaintiff has already named twenty-two defendants in his
02 consolidated suit. Dkt No. 31. The record reflects that all of the defendants have been served
03 in this action. Dkt. No. 9. Defendants Beecroft and Glebe have answered plaintiff's
04 complaint in a timely manner. Dkt. No. 34. However, it appears that two defendants,
05 correctional officers Williams and Walker, have failed to file an answer to plaintiff's
06 complaint.


07 On August 2, 2005, the Court responded to plaintiff's concerns that certain proper
08 defendants to this case had not been served. Dkt. No. 32. Apparently, this precipitated
09 plaintiff's August 29, 2005, letter. Dkt. No. 36. Plaintiff's August 29, 2005, letter is the first
10 mention of incidents involving school teacher Liz and a possible second Williams from the
11 infirmary. To the extent this letter seeks leave to amend the complaint, it is DENIED. The
12 deadline to amend was May 25, 2005. There is no reason given why this deadline should be
13 changed.

14 Having carefully reviewed plaintiff's papers and the available record, the Court
15 ORDERS as follows:

16 (1) Plaintiff's letter (Dkt. No. 36), to the extent it sought leave to amend his
17 complaint and add defendants, is DENIED.

18 (2) Defendants Williams and Walker are directed to answer the complaint no later
19 than September 14, 2005, or alternatively, to show cause as to why a default against them
20 should not be entered.

21 DATED this 31st day of August, 2005.

22
23 
24 JAMES P. DONOHUE
25 United States Magistrate Judge
26